

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DELPHINE ALLEN, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF OAKLAND, et al.,
Defendants.

MASTER CASE FILE
NO. C00-4599 TEH

ORDER RE: PERSONS
RESPONSIBLE FOR CERTAIN
TASKS

On August 31, 2010, this Court ordered Defendants to “identify a senior executive – i.e., someone at the deputy chief level or higher – to be responsible” for certain areas. Aug. 31, 2010 Order at 2. In accordance with the individuals identified by Defendants, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Assistant Chief Howard Jordan shall be responsible for Internal Affairs (Tasks 2-7, 16, 33, and 37); Training (Tasks 42 and 43); and Discipline (Task 45).
2. Deputy Chief Eric Breshears shall be responsible for Use of Force and Supervisory Control (Tasks 18, 20, 24-26, 30, and 35).
3. Deputy Chief Jeffrey Israel shall be responsible for Stop Data (Task 34) and the Personnel Assessment System (Tasks 40 and 41).

As the Court explained in its August 31, 2010 order:


[These individuals] – along with the Chief of Police, who shall continue to bear ultimate responsibility for the entire Department – shall be responsible for ensuring compliance with all aspects of the respective tasks and may, if it appears warranted under the circumstances, face contempt proceedings in this Court. In addition, the identified personnel shall submit brief weekly written reports discussing the identified individual’s personal knowledge of the progress achieved, problems identified, and any other factors relevant to compliance for the tasks in each area during the immediately

1 preceding calendar week (Sunday through Saturday).¹ These reports
2 shall be submitted to the Monitor via electronic mail on each Monday
3 by 12:00 noon, Pacific time, with the first such reports due on
September 27, 2010. The Court will discuss these reports with the
Monitor on a regular basis.

4 *Id.* at 2-3. The Monitor shall have discretion to extend the deadline during holiday periods or
5 if warranted by extenuating circumstances, but such extensions shall be the exception and not
6 the rule. In consultation with the Court, the Monitor shall also have discretion to confer with
7 the designated individuals and Chief Anthony Batts concerning the expected content and
8 format of the reports.

9
10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11
12 Dated: 09/16/10

13 

14 THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 _____
27 ¹In their recently filed joint case management conference statement, both Plaintiffs
28 and Defendants incorrectly referred to “biweekly” reports ordered by the Court. Sept. 9,
2010 Joint CMC Statement at 5, 9. The designated individuals must submit weekly, not
biweekly, reports to the Monitor.